

pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 16-18, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsumori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,650,827, hereinafter Tsumori et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29 call for, among other things, *a method for distributing audio/video content of a **digital** audio/video signal to an analog wireline device including an audio/video input interface receiving the **digital** audio/video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio/video bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources.*

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. Of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Contrary to Examiner's assertion that all elements are disclosed in Tsumori et al., Applicants' claimed elements including: *interface receiving the **digital** audio/video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio/video bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources* are not disclosed in Tsumori et al., so the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Tsumori et al. discloses a television receiver capable of providing a picture-in-picture display and of displaying contents of manual operations performed for the recording of programs (column 1, lines 7-10). Tsumori et al. goes on to disclose receiving audio and video broadcasts via VHF/UHF and a video tape recorder (VHS), which are both **analog** sources, and therefore cannot produce digital audio/video signals as claimed by Applicants'. Tsumori et al. further discloses receiving broadcasts from High Definition Television (HDTV), where HDTV uses MUSE downconversion, a JSB decoder to descramble the signal (where descrambling inherently refers to an analog signal), and a communication satellite (CS) decoder to demodulate the PSK-

modulated signal (column 5, lines 14-48). This is all one process to convert an HDTV signal to a signal that conforms to the NTSC standard for viewing on a television (column 5, lines 49-56). The HDTV source, while digital, is only one type of source, not a plurality of sources. Since the HDTV is only one source, it certainly does not provide the claimed limitation of a *digital audio/video signal from a plurality of sources* or the claimed limitation of *audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to a plurality of sources*. The Examiner cites CS decoding, JSB decoding and MUSE converter as different encoding/decoding techniques, while in reality these are individual process steps in downconverting and decoding a single HDTV signal, which is a single source. Therefore, MUSE, JSB and CS do not provide the use of different encoding/decoding techniques to handle different formats from different sources. They are simply individual steps designed specifically to process an HDTV signal. Since Tsumori et al. does not disclose or teach the claimed limitations of *an interface receiving the digital audio/video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio/video bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources*, Tsumori et al. cannot anticipate applicants' independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29. Therefore, Applicants' respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claims 17-18 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Claims 22-24 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 26-28 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 25 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 25.

Claim 30 depends directly from claim 29 and is believed to be allowable over the relied on reference for at least the same reasons as claim 29.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsumori et al. in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394, hereinafter Schein et al.). Claims 7-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsumori et al. in view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,979, hereinafter Schulhof et al.). Claim 200 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsumori et al. in view of Schein et al. and Schulhoff et al. Applicants' respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

It is incumbent upon the Examiner to prove a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2143). To establish a *prima facie* case three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference.

The combination does not provide Appellants' claimed invention.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29 call for, among other things, *a method for distributing audio/video content of a digital audio/video signal to an analog wireline device including an audio/video input interface receiving the digital audio/video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio/video bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources.*

Schein et al. teaches a method for providing television schedule information to a viewer, and allowing the viewer to interact with schedule information in a remote database (abstract). Schein et al. *only* teaches that signals are received as an analog signal using the NTSC standard or as a digital signal modulated into an analog carrier as is well known in the art. Schulhof et al. teaches a portable digital audio playback module for digital audio file receipt and storage, D/A conversion and playback (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 1).

Applicants' respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29 as drafted clearly distinguish over the cited art. In particular, either Tsumori et al., Schein et al. or Schulhof et al. disclose or teach *a method for distributing audio/video content of a digital audio/video signal to an analog wireline device including an audio/video input interface receiving the digital*

audio/video signal from a plurality of sources and identifying an audio/video bitstream, wherein the audio bitstream comprises audio/video data based on a plurality of encoding methods corresponding to the plurality of sources. Tsumori et al., Schein et al. and Schulhof et al., individually or in combination, do not contain at least these features of the Applicants' claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29, they do not include all of the elements of Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 25 and 29, and therefore cannot anticipate Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, Applicants' respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 14-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claims 19-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are believed to be allowable over the relied on references for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23330

By:

Kevin D. Wills
Kevin D. Wills
Agent of Record
Reg. No.: 43,993
Telephone: 602-952-4399
Fax No.: 602-952-4376